



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,928	12/03/2004	Franz-Leo Heinrichs	2002DE114	7440

25255 7590 09/27/2006

CLARIANT CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
4000 MONROE ROAD
CHARLOTTE, NC 28205

EXAMINER

BRUNSMAN, DAVID M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1755

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/516,928

Applicant(s)

HEINRICHS ET AL.

Examiner

David M. Brunsman

Art Unit

1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20050624.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1755

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms "long-chain" and "short-chain" are indefinite in that "long" and "short" are relative to an unrecited comparison. Claim 2 are written is not clear in the manner by which is further limits claim 1, from which it depends, as the groups "natural" and "synthetic" together would appear to include all ester waxes. There is no basis in base claim 1 for the "montane wax" of claim 4. The spelling of "montane" (construed as montan) is non-standard and otherwise undefined by the instant specification. There is no basis in the base claim 1 for the "polyethylene wax" of claim 19. The term "derivatives" renders the scope of a claim indefinite without explicit recitation of the scope of modification a compound may undergo and yet be considered a "derivative" of the original.

The art made of record and applied in the following rejections is considered representative of the large body of art disclosing mixtures of two of more types of finely ground waxes. The examiner notes a dependent claim which further limits an optional ingredient recited in the base claim, which base claim is anticipated by a prior art disclosure not requiring that optional component, is yet anticipated by the prior art disclosure. The recitation of the intended future uses recited in claims 22-25, 31 and 32 fails to patentably limit the composition comprising the mixture of finely divided waxes absent evidence that a prior art composition would be strictly unsuitable for the recited future use. Absent evidence to the contrary, the manner in which a material is made does not materially distinguish that material of unrecited origin.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Art Unit: 1755

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-19, 22-19, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4342602.

Column 2, lines 29-53, teach mixtures of finely divided polyethylene/polypropylene wax and amide waxes made from "long-chain" fatty acids and ethylene diamine or hexamethylene diamine (a "long-chain" amine in proportions of 64:40 to 40:60.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4342602, as applied above, in view of WO 0164776.

The difference between US 4342602 and the instant claims is the reactants used to make the amide wax. Paragraph [0037] of US 2003/0050381, the English equivalent of WO 0164776, teaches amide waxes may be made by reaction of long chain fatty acids with diethylene amine or ammonia. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the reaction of fatty acid and ammonia in place of that of fatty acid and diethylene amine in US 4342602 because the secondary reference teaches amide waxes may be derived either way.

Claims 1-6 and 8-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 0185855, published 15 November 2001.

Table 2 of US 2003/0154885 A1, the English equivalent of WO 0185855, teaches mixtures of two or more types of finely divided waxes. Code M1, the first entry, teaches of 50:50 mixture of oxidized metallocene polyethylene wax and carnauba wax.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Brunsman whose telephone number is 571-272-1365. The examiner can normally be reached on M, Th, F, Sa; 7:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 1755

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1362. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David M Brunzman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755

DMB

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'David M. Brunzman', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.